

NATION'S FUND FOR NURSES.

"YE CAN DENEE WHAT YE'VE SAID, BUT YE CANNNA DENEE WHAT YE'VE WRIT."—*Scottish Proverb.*

Sir Arthur Stanley visited Nottingham on October 16, and spoke in the Exchange Hall in support of "The Nation's Fund for Nurses," through which appeal to the charitable the College of Nursing, Ltd., is being endowed. The Mayor presided.

In his address Sir Arthur denied a "suggestion sometimes made that the College wrecked this year's Nurses Bill. On the contrary, their supporters voted for the second reading, but certain very necessary amendments that had to be put in to make the Bill workable were not inserted at the Committee stage, and the College supporters had to withdraw its support. The main reason the Bill failed to secure the further support of the House of Commons was because it absolutely failed to give any recognition to the governing bodies of the hospitals which were the training schools for nurses. The Minister of Health (Dr. Addison) undertook last session to bring forward a Bill for the Registration of Nurses. That Bill was under preparation, and he was not without hope that it might be on the Statute-book at the end of this year."

A resolution that a fund be raised locally to augment the funds of the College of Nursing, and that a Committee be formed for the purpose was proposed by Mr. Frederick Acton, chairman of the General Hospital, Nottingham.

Councillor Dr. A. Fulton, seconding, trusted that soon there would be no rival organisations, and that the nursing and medical professions would be one large, active society.

The resolution was carried unanimously.

These statements give us food for thought, and we are unable to reconcile Sir Arthur Stanley's statements with facts.

The Nurses' Registration Bill was purposely wrecked in the Commons by the Council of the College of Nursing, Ltd., through a whip sent out in Circular Letter form to nurse members, full of inaccuracies, and by the obstructive policy of Mr. Leonard Lyle, the College representative, supported by four members for Manchester Districts, briefed by the officials of the Manchester Royal Infirmary, for years a hotbed of autocratic reaction, so far as Nurses' Registration is concerned. To attempt to deny this policy is useless. It is in print, and can therefore be proved—the urgent whip to College members to earnestly beg Members of Parliament not to support the Central Committee's Bill, Circulars to Members of Parliament, the untrue Statement issued by Miss Ferrier, and all the Amendments in the Standing Committee and on the Orders of the Day in the House, have been carefully tabulated and filed in the State Registration Office for future historic accuracy. That the reason for the College's wrecking policy was, as Sir Arthur Stanley states, because recognition was not given to the lay Governing Bodies of the Training Schools,

is a fact. It has always been the policy of these employers to oppose legal status and a degree of self-government for trained nurses. They have pursued this autocratic and selfish policy for thirty years, and have done much to ruin the nursing schools in consequence.

Neither the Medical Schools nor the Midwifery Schools attached to hospitals are represented on the General Medical Council or on the Central Midwives Board, and these laymen have no real grievance in not dominating, as they wish to do, the General Nursing Council set up in the Central Committee's Bill. When a probationer and nurse has fulfilled her contract with a hospital its Committee has no right to control her life personally or professionally. It is a monstrous claim, to which no body of women workers should submit.

A WORD TO DR. FULTON.

We cannot believe Dr. Fulton, who supported Sir Arthur Stanley, realises the result of his hope that the nurses' organisations which have been working for professional reform years before the College Company was formed, should all be snuffed out! We would ask him, as a member of the British Medical Association, what would be his attitude if a company of laymen adopted the same policy toward his powerful Association? One of determined revolt, we make no doubt. Medical men have no right to unite with the laity to fetter the liberties of trained nurses, and to advocate for them a professional policy to which they would not submit themselves.

Has Dr. Fulton read the Constitution of the College of Nursing, Ltd.? If so, what does he think of the Clause nurse members are compelled to sign, agreeing to expulsion by the Council without right of appeal? Until that tyrannical clause is eliminated we can promise that what Dr. Fulton calls "rival organisations" (pioneer organisations would be more accurate) will continue very much alive.

It is the autocratic policy of the College, controlled as it is by an Executive of rich and powerful hospital governors and officials, which is driving the independent and self-supporting wing of the nursing profession to protect itself through a Trade Union.

COMING EVENTS.

October 30th.—Society for State Registration of Nurses. Meeting Executive Committee, 431, Oxford Street, London, W. 4 p.m.

October 31st.—Quarterly Meeting of the Matrons' Council. The President, Miss M. Heather-Bigg in the chair. 431, Oxford Street, London, W.1. 3 p.m. Tea 5 p.m.

November 6th.—National Council of Trained Nurses' Annual Meeting, 431, Oxford Street, London, W. 4 p.m.

November 8th.—Trade Union for Trained Nurses. Mass Meeting, Mortimer Hall, Mortimer Street, Great Portland Street, London, W. 3 p.m. Nurses and friends cordially invited.

[previous page](#)

[next page](#)